

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Right To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for more than 5 years a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, of which the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] is chairman, has been holding hearings and issuing reports in an endeavor to establish the practice of requiring the executive departments to disclose to congressional committees, and perhaps Congressmen, information which is necessary to determine whether new legislation is needed, and, if needed, the type of legislation which will best serve the public interest, and also to learn the effect which existing legislation had, or is having, upon the general welfare.

This issue is as old as the Government itself.

In my humble judgment, the Congress, through its committees, and perhaps individual Congressmen, is entitled to be informed by the executive departments of all information needed to enable the Congress to adequately serve the people.

Several times, as the only Republican on the special subcommittee, it has been suggested by me that the subcommittee or its counsel frame a series of questions calling for information vitally needed to enable the Congress to properly execute its legislative functions.

Those questions should be submitted to the Department and, if refusal is made, then the subcommittee should report to the full committee, which should in turn call the situation to the attention of the House, and if, in the judgment of the House, the questions were proper, the refusal to answer not justified, the issue should be referred to the Attorney General for contempt proceedings, or the House, itself, should cite those responsible for the denial of information to appear before the House and make defense to a contempt charge, or submit to whatever procedure the House might determine to be necessary.

The matter could then be brought before the U.S. Supreme Court, whose function it is to determine disputes between the legislative and the executive departments.

The special subcommittee has been highly critical of the past administration. When a new administration came into power, the same position as to the disclosure of information by the executive departments which was established when the issue was first presented to our first President was adhered to.

In fact, the Kennedy administration went further in its refusal than perhaps did the previous administration.

Still more recently, the Secretary of Defense has taken a firm position that certain information on which the disciplining of General Walker was based would not be disclosed.

In my judgment, the limitation or the extent of the right of the legislative branch to information in the hands of the executive departments will never be determined until the Supreme Court has made a decision.

Commodore John Barry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

COMMODORE JOHN BARRY

I beg the indulgence of the House for a few moments in order to pay tribute to one of the great heroes of American history, and one of the stoutest sailors who ever bestrode a quarterdeck. John Barry, "the fighting commodore," was born in the tiny village of Tacumshane, County Wexford, Ireland, in the year 1745, the exact date of his birth being unknown. Those were the days when all Ireland groaned under the oppressor's heel and the lot of the genuine sons of the soil was foredoomed from birth. There was but one hope for the enterprising: to quit their native land and seek their fortunes under more clement skies, under kinder governments. More than half a million Irish are said to have emigrated during the first half of the 18th century alone, the greater part to take service as foreign mercenaries. There was plenty of fighting going on in those days, and battle is a milieu in which an Irishman always feels quite at home.

To young Barry the sea, lapping at his door on Wexford Harbor, sent an imperative call; the lad heard and answered, and thenceforth, to the end of his long life, the sea remained his first, last, and enduring love. At the age of 10 he shipped as cabin boy on a merchantman, carrying with him, his biographer tells us, "hatred of the oppressors and recollections of the misery and want of his childhood years, which stayed with him throughout his life." And to the end of his days his purse was ever open to his poverty-stricken kindred from the old country.

By the year 1770 he had settled in Philadelphia, discovering in America, we are told, "the land of his desire." The outbreak of the Revolution found him with the certificate of master mariner, married to an American wife and a well-known and respected figure in the city of his adoption. He hastened to offer his services to the State and country which had taken him in and whose hospitality he was so richly to repay. Placed by the Continental Congress in command of the brig, *Lexington*, one of the first ships of the infant American Navy, Barry captured, on April 17, 1776, the small auxiliary ship *Edward*—the first capture, in actual battle, of a British naval vessel by a regu-

larly commissioned American warship. On August 10 following, Barry was placed by resolution of Congress seventh in order of commission on the list of captains. Incidentally, it might be pointed out that, contrary to popular belief, Barry never attained the rank of commodore save by courtesy. By the end of his active career, however, he had become the senior captain in the U.S. Navy and bore, by common consent, the courtesy title of "Commodore" until his death. Whenever, in the years following the establishment of independence, the word "commodore" was heard in American naval circles it could mean but one man. Again, as his able biographer, the naval historian, William Bell Clark, observes, "John Barry was not 'the first officer appointed to the first vessel purchased' by the Continental Congress. His initial service was far more important—he outfitted the first Continental Fleet. He was never the senior officer of the Continental Navy, but his record through the Revolution was consistently finer than any of his naval contemporaries save John Paul Jones. And he can be classed on a par with Jones." "He was not," writes Mr. Clark, "the Father of the American Navy" in the sense of being its founder, but his devotion to that navy, whose first ship he launched and equipped, coupled with the fact that he trained many of the lads who later added glory to its history, entitles him to the appellation in the modified form it was first bestowed upon him in 1813."

I cannot, of course, in this brief talk enter into a discussion of the brilliant engagements which starred Barry's brilliant career in the Revolution and the two unofficial wars against the Algerine pirates and the French which followed. Suffice to say that his ships, notably the *Raleigh*, the *Albion*, and the *United States*, shine forever luminous in the pages of American naval history.

He died full of years and honor on the 13th day of September, 1803. He sleeps in old St. Mary's Churchyard in the city and country of his adoption, which he so faithfully and nobly served. A contemporary poet wrote of him:

"There are gallant hearts whose glory
Columbia loves to name,
Whose deeds shall live in story
And everlasting fame.

But never yet one braver
Our stately banner bore
Than saucy old Jack Barry
The Irish commodore."

Death Takes Distinguished West Virginian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I advise the House of the death of the Honorable Clarence W. Meadows, a former Governor of West Virginia, who died at the young age of 57 of a heart attack in Clifton Forge, Va.

I extend my sincere and heartfelt sympathy to his grieving widow and children.

Governor Meadows served as the chief executive of our State from January 1945 until January of 1949.

His career as a lawyer and a public servant was distinguished.

**"Improving the Urban Environment"—
Address by Senator Williams of New
Jersey**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, no member of this body has contributed more to legislative progress on urban matters than the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. He is the author of two outstanding legislative breakthroughs written into this year's housing bill—one launching a new program of aid to mass transportation, the other a new program of assistance to local communities in the preservation of open space.

At the recent conference of the American Municipal Association in Seattle, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] delivered an address which is a cogent and penetrating analysis of some of the current dilemmas facing urban America. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVING THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT

(Address by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Democrat, of New Jersey, to the annual conference of the American Municipal Association, Seattle, Wash., August 28, 1961)

I regard my task today as rather formidable, as a layman charged with the task of telling this assemblage of the Nation's foremost body of expert practitioners how to improve the urban environment.

But if I may, I'd like to plunge ahead and say that if there is one characteristic that stands out about our cities and towns it is our general complacency toward them.

I think we would agree that most of our cities do not fulfill our conception of our own private Brazilia. In fact, when you get right down to it, they leave much to be desired. Slums, traffic congestion, city crime, minority group ghettos, suburban sprawl, polluted air, roadside slum towns, neon nightmares—most of our cities are scarred with them.

Yet so few people ever seem to complain about the ever-present eyesores in the urban environment. As a nation of mostly urban people, we seem to have become almost insensate to the staggering ugliness and squalor surrounding us.

A commentary on our times can be seen in the scholarly books that are being written, jam-packed with statistics on urban living, that project the statistics into future and usually disturbing trends. But notice how often you see a statement in the preface of the book that says: "The conclusions or pro-

jections made in the succeeding chapters are based on the assumption that no significant public policy changes will occur from those public policies of the present."

At the other end of the scale from the disinterested chronicles of our urban perdition are the urbane critics.

For example, Frank Lloyd Wright, who when asked to come to Pittsburgh and look at its problems, is said to have replied to the city fathers: "Gentlemen, there is only one solution. Abandon it."

I think, however, that we wouldn't be here today if we didn't have hope for the urban future of America. Certainly the task presents the greatest challenge that any of us could ask for. I think that in a very real sense the mayors and officials charged with the development of our urban and metropolitan areas are on the frontlines of the cold war battlefield.

When you stop to think that the metropolitan areas account for 75 percent of the Nation's economic productivity, it becomes apparent that the decisions affecting the growth of development of these areas have a major impact on our ability to meet the grave international challenges of the sixties.

I would like to talk today about several important but more or less random problem areas that loom large in our efforts to improve the urban environment.

HOUSING AND URBAN RENEWAL

The first is housing and urban renewal. A decade ago we made a national commitment to eliminate our slums, to replace them with new housing and a better environment. It was a great and inspiring idea, and after a slow start, we are now ready for full-scale action, with the new authorization of the Housing Act and with a new and determined administration.

For this reason, I think it is appropriate for us to stop a moment to review our past accomplishments. We have produced a great deal that has had good and lasting value, but at the same time, we have all seen mammoth public housing projects that look more like penal institutions than homes for people. We have seen months and years of enormous effort result in a rapid, almost sterile civic centers and urban renewal projects.

I think the moral we can draw from our past experience is that money isn't everything.

Now that we have \$2 billion to work with, thanks to the Housing Act, I think it is of greatest importance to redouble and reemphasize our concern for the esthetic and human values involved in any program to rebuild our cities.

For a long time I think it is fair to say that we scarcely even recognized that there even was a problem in reconciling the old and the new. But the storms of protest over the destruction of treasured buildings that had a flavor of charm or history have made us more conscious of this problem.

Perhaps some of you saw the dramatic photograph not too long ago of the group of Greenwich Villagers who painted the white crosses of demolition in their eyeglasses. It was a haunting sight.

Fortunately, under the able new leadership of Dr. Weaver and as a result of the 1961 Housing Act, I think we will begin to see a much more vigorous exploration of the potentialities of rehabilitation and restoration. The dividends—both financial and esthetic—can be considerable, as you can see from a walk in Georgetown, in the Nation's Capital.

However, there is no getting around the inherent conflicts involved in reconciling the old and the new. In some cases, good sound buildings may have to give way for the sake of the overall design of the urban renewal project.

As Dr. Weaver said in a speech not too long ago in New York, "Where there is an occasional sound structure in a sea of hopeless ones, it is not feasible—or in my opinion desirable—to destroy a redevelopment plan by an inflexible application of sound principle."

And then there is the problem that arises when we do try to preserve and restore existing structures in an urban renewal project.

This is the design problem of making the new harmonize with the old. Sometimes the contrasts of old and new are quite effective. Other times they strike a jarring and discordant note.

The other day I saw a photograph of a new high-rise apartment that was developed privately on Beacon Street in Boston. While I haven't seen it in person, the picture struck me as one of the best reconciliations of old and new that I have seen in some time. The staid four-story townhouses on the street feature prominent bay windows, and the apartment building, rising next to them on the street carried out this bay window effect by constructing the front walls and windows of each apartment on prow-shaped angles, thereby giving a bay window motif to the whole face of the apartment building.

Philadelphia has also been giving great attention to the design problem of blending old and new. Its Washington Square East renewal project, which includes the very historic area of Society Hill, put five developers into competition not only on the inherent merit of the architectural designs, but also on the extent to which they fit into and enhance the surrounding environment. The competition was taken so seriously that the five developers spent some \$260,000 on their own on the site and architectural plans.

Similar kinds of problems can be seen in the area of public housing.

I was struck, for example, by the renewal program for southwest Washington. In one of the blocks that has been completed, there is a high-rise apartment separated by a mall from a series of rather high-priced townhouses, painted in various pastel colors. Directly across the street from these townhouses is a similar series of attached public housing units, with a uniform and rather drab brick facade. And of course wire fences around each small backyard.

What pains me about this above-average-looking public housing project is that for only slightly more money, the appearance of this project could have been made every bit as attractive—and as much of an asset to the whole area—as the luxury townhouses right across the street.

I have been disturbed by the legislative restrictions written into the public housing law requiring maximum economy-type construction. In other words, keep the housing bone bare, no matter how much of a community eyesore is produced.

Added to these are regulations that have accumulated like barnacles over the years. They are enough to sap the initiative and imaginative energy of the most dedicated housing official. I knew that the new Public Housing Commissioner, Mrs. McGuire, is determined to breathe new life and imagination into this program, and I am confident that we are going to see wholehearted encouragement of better public housing from now on.

The Housing Act also provides \$5 million for demonstrations in low-income housing, which could be of great help in putting a better face on a very important program.

Not too long ago the New York Times carried a front page article reporting on a recommendation made by Elizabeth Wood of Chicago that we start building English-style

pubs in our public housing projects, the way they do in England and the Scandinavian countries.

Of course I can hear someone asking whether the tenants of public housing in this country would care for darts and warm beer. But the principle behind this proposal is an important one—to provide a convivial meeting place where people can gather to enjoy themselves, rather than feed in isolation on their miseries or frustrations.

Obviously this is but one of many possibilities of dealing with the social as well as the physical aspects of public housing.

OPEN SPACE

Closely related to housing and urban renewal is the problem of open space, both in the cities and at the suburban fringe.

As a part of the Housing Act, Congress passed the major provisions of the open space bill I had introduced earlier this year, providing up to 30 percent in grants to State and local governments for the acquisition and preservation of open space. We now have a program of \$50 million for this purpose.

I think it goes without saying that we need much more open space in our cities, and we need open space of all kinds—parks, playgrounds, recreation areas, intimate islands of green, stately malls, shop-lined plazas, wooded pathways, and cloisters—to meet the multitude of human needs in a city.

I recognize that providing open space in cities means a loss of tax ratables. But I am convinced that open space in our cities can be not only esthetically rewarding, but good business too.

For one thing, if well placed, open space can materially enhance adjacent property values, and curb the spread of deterioration and decay. As my good friend from East Orange, Mayor Kelly, is fond of saying: "When the amenities go, blight moves in."

Business and community leaders are also beginning to realize that commercial attractions alone will not lure many suburban housewives, if they must continue to endure the slings and arrows of outrageous annoyance in the downtown areas. Kalamazoo, Mich. has done it, San Francisco has done it, and I earnestly hope more and more cities will begin to explore the possibility of converting some of their tension-filled thoroughfares into tree-lined malls for exclusive pedestrian use.

Open space at the fringe is equally important, for the onrush of urbanism is gobbling up more than a million acres a year. Thus each year we push nature's horizon farther and farther away from more and more people.

Some people seem to think that this is mostly a problem for the heavily populated eastern seaboard—that megalopolis of 31 million people stretching from New Hampshire to Newport News.

Indeed it is a problem for us in the East. But there is a real opportunity for the many smaller rapidly growing urban areas all over the country to acquire open space out beyond the fringe at reasonable cost so that when the growth and development and expansion does come, the open space will be there as an integral part of the total community.

And we need the open space for a variety of reasons—for recreation needs that cannot be met by the backyard or a weekend drive to the country. We need it to prevent the spread of gray areas, to enhance adjacent property values, to provide relief from the monotony of continuous suburban development, to serve as buffers to keep communities from merging into an indistin-

guishable blob, to protect stream valleys, forest preserves, flood plains, and prime agricultural land.

We influence land use patterns when we preserve land for open space; we influence it when we decide to subdivide the land for residential development.

One problem that I don't think has received sufficient attention is the nearly total commitment of nearly all our suburban communities to uniformly low-density residential development.

We seem to have given very little thought to the fact that low-density sprawl means greater costs for more schools, more roads, more public facilities of almost every kind, and less open space. Then, of course, there will be the repair bills to pay when all these relatively new facilities begin to wear out.

A very revealing illustration of the comparative costs of different types of land use can be seen in the proposal of a developer to cluster some 250 homes on 6 percent of the 516-acre Whitney estate in Old Westbury, Long Island. The land was zoned 2-acre, which means with conventional development the entire tract would have been taken up by the 250 houses, and the land development costs, for earthwork, street paving, drainage, sewers, utilities, landscaping and so forth, would have been \$2.7 million. By clustering the homes on only a small part of the tract in a series of two- or three-family townhouses, each with a private patio, the land development costs for the same facilities would have been \$1.1 million—a saving of \$1.6 million. And 94 percent of the very lovely land would have remained in its natural state—to the benefit of the residents and to the benefit of the town which would have gained from the enhanced value of the adjacent property.

I am sorry to report that this proposal did not gain the approval of the town fathers, but I think it illustrates the important economic implications that lie behind the zoning ordinance.

I am sure all of you have experienced occasions where prime industrial land needed for the future development of your area has been nibbled away by residential development because funds weren't available for acquisition on the land. Then there is the problem of acquiring land for highways, which could be done in advance at tremendously less cost, but usually isn't because of lack of funds or statutory authority.

Edward Higbee, in his informative book, "The Squeeze," described the costs involved in building a highway through a small community out on Long Island. Just before the suburban development was built in the early 1950's, he writes, the land "might have cost between \$2,000 and \$4,000 per acre. Once it had been covered with split-levels, the condemnation charges had risen to perhaps \$50,000 per acre—and it takes 60 acres per mile to build a modern expressway. To cut a 10-mile swath through settled communities, in order to make roads leading to other newer communities beyond, can cost as much as \$30 million."

At \$4,000 an acre 10 years ago, the land for the same 10 miles of highway would have cost only \$4 million.

I think it is fair to say that the subject of urban land use is overripe for serious study at all levels of Government.

It might interest you to know that I had the pleasure of introducing an administration proposal, in conjunction with my open space bill, which would have provided loans for the acquisition of land for future public or private development. Unfortunately, this proposal received no serious consideration, largely because there were so many other things to talk about during the hearings on the housing bill.

This proposal was directed toward the kinds of problems I have mentioned—the need for land for future industrial development, for future highways, schools, parks and so forth. I think we ought to be giving much more thought to this problem than we have been, and I hope some consideration will be given next year.

URBAN TRANSPORTATION

Finally, I would like to touch on the problem of urban transportation. I don't think I will be saying anything to cause the rocks to fly, but I will say that someday we—all of us—have got to start coming to grips with that wonderful and infernal thing we call the automobile.

It is one of the great paradoxes that the invention that gave more people more physical freedom than anything else in our history is now on the verge of tying almost all of us into paralyzing knots at least two times a day.

Probably no one has ever devised a more cunning device of human torture—in peacetime at least—than the traffic jam.

And its economic implications are staggering. Each year we lose more than \$5 billion in traffic jams, through wages lost, lower retail sales, higher costs for moving freight, overly rapid depreciation of vehicles, and so forth. The cost of accidents is even greater, estimated at about \$6 billion a year.

This problem of traffic congestion in our larger urban and metropolitan areas manifestly cannot be solved by highways alone, as the President noted in his housing message to Congress.

But even if we were willing to take the tax increases in an effort to meet all our transportation needs with an urban highway program averaging some \$10 million or more a mile, there is every possibility that the remedy would only succeed in killing the patient—by replacing valuable tax ratable property with nontaxable concrete and asphalt, by creating huge downtown parking demands which would further remove land for commercial and cultural purposes, and by slowly carving away the very activities that created the demand for access in the first place.

I don't think there is any question that we need limited access highways to meet urban transportation needs that can be met in no other way.

But improvement of inherently more efficient and less space-consuming forms of modern mass transportation is an absolute necessity if our cities are to survive the onslaught of the automobile and continue as viable structures for human existence and enterprise.

The only alternative is a massive decentralization of our metropolitan areas, which, if pursued, could easily cover every square mile of land in the country with developments within a few hundred years, given our present population growth rate.

Even the short-range future gives cause for concern. The urban population today is over 100 million, and 90 percent of our national population growth will occur in and around our urban areas. The number of vehicles on the road today is around 70 million. By 1975, that number is expected to climb to well over 100 million.

At the same time, we have been suffering a serious decline in ridership on all forms of mass transportation. Since 1950, the decline has been 38 percent. More than 300 smaller towns have lost all forms of public transportation completely, despite the fact that half of our population is not able to drive: the young, the old, the infirm, and those too poor to own an automobile.

Because of these trends, there has been a tendency to assume that this is a dying

and unnecessary service, not worth preserving.

But it is important to point out that most of this decline has occurred in off-peak hours and on weekends. The decline in rush hour use has been much smaller, and in many areas is showing an upturn.

But we have tended to overlook the fact that if we allow this service to go under, the alternative costs would be staggering. For example, your own organization has estimated that if the five cities of New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and Cleveland were to lose just their rail commuter service, it would cost \$31 billion with 30-year, 4 percent financing to build the highways necessary to serve a comparable number of people.

The trouble is that this loss in passenger revenue, combined with rising operating costs, is making it harder and harder for the railroad and bus companies to stay alive, without taking retrenching action, which merely makes the service less desirable.

Despite the almost total lack of imaginative effort in this field, there are some illustrations of the potential for progress if funds are made available.

Several years ago, the Boston and Albany Railroad, down to about 3,000 riders a day on its Highland branch line, was petitioning strenuously to eliminate all its service. The Boston MTA took over the 11-mile line, linked it up with the subway system, turned it into rapid transit-type service, and is now pushing the figure of 30,000 riders a day, despite the fact that it isn't really rapid service operating on an exclusive right of way.

Philadelphia entered into a contract with the Pennsylvania Railroad to provide more frequent service at lower fares on a line running out to Chestnut Hill. The experiment proved so successful, increasing ridership by some 30 percent and reducing by 400 the number of cars coming into the downtown each day, that the program is being expanded to other lines, and now the counties are so interested that they plan to enter into a compact with the city to improve rail transportation for the region as a whole.

Chicago can point to two significant developments. The first being the almost unprecedented phenomenon of a railroad making money on its commuter service. Not much money, to be sure, but in the black. That railroad is the Chicago and Northwestern, under the aggressive, far-sighted leadership of its chairman, Ben Heineman, who is providing modern, clean and courteous service to the commuters.

The second is the rapid transit system operating in the median strip of the Congress Street Expressway. This line is operating at only about 25 percent of its capacity, but it is already carrying more rush-hour traffic than the 8-lane highway, which is operating at full capacity. The value of this transit line is immeasurable, when you think of what would happen if the transit riders were forced to their cars on this already crowded highway.

Many other cities are far advanced in the planning stages, and with the acceptance by the Federal Government of its proper responsibility in this problem of national concern, and with the full efforts of our State and local governments, we should begin to get the creaking wheels turning again.

As I stated in the beginning, I have chosen just some of the problem areas that concern me. There are many others, from water pollution to family relocation.

In discussing these particular problems, I should stress that they are inter-related and, indeed, inseparable problems. It is my hope that the Housing and Home Finance Agency will begin to coordinate its programs more effectively in the future, so that they help

to complement one another, rather than conflict with each other as they sometimes do. Creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs should go a long way toward providing that coordination, and I hope that someday we will see all our Federal aid programs geared into comprehensive, area-wide plans for the urban and metropolitan areas—plans for the people, of the people, and by the people whose lives are being affected by them.

If this planning and coordination is achieved, I think we will have a fighting chance of becoming the masters of our urban destiny, rather than the victims of it.

Tribute to David Sarnoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on Wednesday, August 30 it was my privilege to be a guest of my Senate colleagues Senators AIKEN, MAGNUSON, PAS-TORE, JAVITS, and KEATING as tribute was paid to Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America. The occasion of the tribute was the 55th anniversary of General Sarnoff's participation in the field of electronics.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the introductory remarks of Senator AIKEN in presenting General Sarnoff to the assembled guests at this luncheon gathering and the text of the general's response be printed in the RECORD.

It has been my pleasure to hear many outstanding speeches by our Nation's leaders and I do not know that I have ever been more moved than I was on this occasion as I listened to David Sarnoff. It is with pride I present his remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY SENATOR AIKEN

General Sarnoff, Mrs. Smith, gentlemen, we are not proceeding according to plan. Some considerate person has insisted on a live quorum over in the Senate and that necessitates a change in our plans.

Twenty-one years ago, I attended the World's Fair in New York as part of the Governor's Conference of the United States. While we were there we had a demonstration of something new. It was new to all of us—and it was called television. I don't remember what the program was but I think the Governors themselves were part of the program. What I remember best about it is that the receiving set was upstairs and the transmitting equipment was downstairs, with a floor between us. Now that seemed like a whale of a distance in those days to transmit a picture. It isn't so far now. But I didn't know at that time that the man responsible for that new and promising innovation would be honored by the Members of the Senate as their guest here today. But it certainly is appropriate that he should be.

I'm not going into his background, which is known not only to everybody here in the

United States, but all over the world as well. At the age of 15 he got into his only good suit and went out and got a job. Twenty-four years later, and several suits later, he became president of the RCA and then chairman of the board. But I do want to call attention to one thing. He was first educated in a public school, but thereafter he attended the Sarnoff school—which is the best in the world, scientifically speaking—and he plans to attend that school for many years to come. Even though his formal education ended with the public schools in New York, he has been honored by receiving 21 degrees from the best colleges in our country.

Now that is a record for men, I guess. But I want to tell you, General, that you're in the presence of a champion here today because our colleague, Senator SMITH from Maine, has 36 degrees, or she did have 36 the last time I counted them. So I'm sure that you are honored by having a world's champion at this luncheon today.

This is the occasion of General Sarnoff's 55th anniversary in communications. He has been honored by scientific, industrial, military, civil, cultural groups, and now I think it's a great privilege that we Members of the U.S. Senate also honor him at this luncheon. We had planned to have my colleague, the chairman of the Commerce Committee of the U.S. Senate, introduce some of the Senators who then would be called upon for brief remarks. However, we know what the Sergeant at Arms does to us when we don't answer rollcalls and, in order to keep us all out of jail, or out of what correspondents to jail in the Senate, I'm going to ask General Sarnoff to speak to us right now instead of later, had we gone through with the program as planned. [Applause.]

REMARKS BY DAVID SARNOFF

Mr. Chairman and distinguished Members of the U.S. Senate. I am unprepared for this sudden projection into the arena, and there are times in one's life when the tongue is a little dry and the mind a little overwhelmed. In the language of my profession, that makes for a poor transmitter—and that describes me at this moment. However, I am comforted by the knowledge that your receivers are unimpaired and in good tune. Therefore I would like, Mr. Chairman, with your permission, to transmit for a few minutes on the frequency that originates in the heart, without interference from that of the mind.

During the years I have spent in the electronics industry, which is worldwide in its scope, I have had to travel widely both at home and abroad. Of all my trips, four stand out in my memory and they will remain with me as long as I live. I would like to say a word or two about each of these four trips—not because I would presume upon your patience to indulge in reminiscence, but because I think that these trips, together, symbolize the spirit, the meaning, the purpose, and the opportunities of America.

My first trip was made in 1900 when I left with my mother and two brothers the country of my birth, Russia. I was then 9 years old and the oldest of the children. We sailed across the Atlantic Ocean in a small and slow ship. We traveled in the steerage and it took us more than a month to arrive in the United States—the wonderful new land of opportunity. When I arrived in New York, I was unable to speak or understand a word of English. I was in a new world, in a new society, a new people. However, it didn't take me very long to reap all the advantages of America's fine and free public school system—nor did anybody interfere with me when I worked as a news-

boy before and after school hours, in order to help support myself and my family.

That was trip No. 1 in my memory.

Trip No. 2 came only 9 years later. As a boy of 18, I sailed on the S.S. *New York* of the American Line, from New York to Southampton, England. This time I traveled as the Marconi wireless operator on the ship. I was the only operator aboard, for it wasn't until the *Titanic* disaster in 1912 that a law was passed by the Congress requiring each passenger ship to carry a complement of wireless operators who could serve around the clock. So there I was, 9 years after arriving in this country, serving as the Marconi wireless operator on a first-class passenger liner, with a first-class cabin all to myself, with a uniform and gold braid, classified as a ship's officer, messing with the captain and the other officers, and entertaining and being entertained by the first-class passengers.

That was another trip for my memory.

My third trip, 20 years later, in 1929, was on the SS *Aquitania*. I left New York for Paris as an assistant to Mr. Owen D. Young, who was Chairman of the U.S. Reparations Commission. In addition to Mr. Young, I accompanied Mr. J. P. Morgan, Mr. Thomas Lamont, and Mr. Nelson Perkins, all members of the Commission. Our mission was to reach final agreement with the Germans on the debts and other problems left by World War I, and to replace what was then the Dawes plan with what later became the Young plan. In the company of these financial and industrial giants, and working as Mr. Young's assistant, I was selected to negotiate on behalf of our allies with Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, who represented the Germans. I carried on these negotiations with Dr. Schacht for some 6 weeks. Of course, we thought then we had solved the pressing problems of that time but we found out very soon thereafter that our plans and our hopes were all dashed to the ground by Adolf Hitler who repudiated the agreement that was signed in Paris.

However, the impressive and human part of that trip to me was not only the companionship of these important men, who were much older and wiser than I, but the fact that I was a member of that group, and that we were met at Cherbourg by high officials of the French Government. This time, no passport problems, no baggage problems, no customs problems. Our reception was conducted with the pomp and protocol that the French are so expert in providing. We were taken from a special tender to a private train supplied by the French Government which whisked us to Paris and the comforts of the Ritz Hotel.

I shall never forget the moment, during this third trip, when I stood on the deck of that tender, reflecting upon this novel experience. The picture that flashed through my mind then was my first crossing of the Atlantic in the steerage. I thought of the contrast between the two trips and the fact that this could happen only in America. For it is as true today as it was then, that no other country in the world provides such vast opportunities to develop and to express whatever talents an individual may possess. On that occasion, I remember saying to myself, "God bless America." Surely I am no exception for there are many, many others in the United States who have also developed, advanced and prospered. I have tried to convey this message to the rising generation of Americans and to point out to them that in my view there are more opportunities in our country today than there were when I arrived in New York in 1900. There are more people in the world, more wants to satisfy, and more resources and tools to employ today than there were then. No American boy or girl needs to weep with Alexander that there are no more worlds to conquer.

Now I come to my fourth trip, and that has occurred only today. From New York, I have come to the Capital of this Nation to be received and honored by the distinguished Members of the U.S. Senate—the greatest deliberative body in the world. I am not sure that any man deserves so great an honor as you are bestowing upon me, but I do want to express to you, Mr. Chairman, and to your distinguished colleagues, how deeply moved and profoundly grateful I am for the friendship you have shown me, for this handsome tribute and this wonderful reception.

I will not presume further upon your time, because I know that you must respond to the Senate rollcall. So I simply say, with all my heart, thank you and God bless you.

CLOSING REMARKS BY SENATOR AIKEN

And now, General Sarnoff, in order that you may have something with which really to remember your visit here today, it is my privilege to present you with this scroll and to read its inscription: "55th anniversary testimonial to David Sarnoff in commemoration of his dedicated service and outstanding contributions to the advancement of communications and electronics in the United States." [Applause.] And so that there may not be any anticlimax to the general's response, we will consider the meeting adjourned.

Emergency Feed Grains Bill, H.R. 4510

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, in the support of my continual plea for less Federal interference in agriculture, and the operation of free marketing system, I would like to offer the following feature story from the September 10 issue of the *Kansas City Star*. To properly digest the point made by the article it is necessary that I roll back the calendar a bit, specifically to Tuesday, February 21, 1961, when the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains was considering the emergency feed grains bill, H.R. 4510. During that hearing the bill received the complete backing of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Referring to the published hearings on H.R. 4510, serial A, pages 42 and 43, the following colloquy between the new Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Orville Freeman, and me took place. Secretary Freeman was supporting the bill:

Mr. BEERMANN?

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Secretary, I appreciate your position. I am an operating farmer, with five brothers. You have an operation with someone else.

I would like to ask a question: Are we to understand that the Secretary is establishing the price of soybeans at \$2.30.

Secretary FREEMAN. It has not been established as of now. This is at present my intention, to so establish it.

Mr. BEERMANN. Thank you.

Now, corn is \$1.06 and it is in trouble. Soybeans are \$1.85 and they are not in trouble. I fail to understand how raising the

price of soybeans to \$2.30 and eventually asking me to grow soybeans, which I do not now, and then eventually asking the Government to buy my soybeans, is going to be a solution of our problem.

Secretary FREEMAN. I would only answer that by saying that although the support price is as you represented it, the market price is now about \$2.47, and, as I have tried to indicate before, the best estimates we make are that there will be a stronger demand for soybeans and a greater need for them than there will be for feed grains.

Mr. BEERMANN. Thank you.

The soybean market price is presently strong because of industry promotion and grower ability to produce for a consuming market at a fair price, with a minimum of Government intervention. This is not so with the other feed grains. I do not think that two wrongs make a right. I would not like to see us get soybeans in the same position as feed grains.

I will say here that I do not know how to run your farm; I do not suppose that you know how to run mine, and I do not believe it is within the jurisdiction of this group of people to tell us how to run our farms, which is what is taking place by establishing market prices. I would like to offer for your consideration in all future legislation that when you submit these things, I am asking it simply from a farmer's standpoint, that you do it on the basis of having less Government in farm business instead of more.

I thank you.

Secretary FREEMAN. Thank you.

The point I was attempting to make in the above colloquy was that by raising the support price of soybeans, the Secretary would create the same problem for the soybean growers and soybean industry that Government intervention had created for feed grains.

I believe the following article indicates that my concern about the action of Secretary Freeman is becoming a reality. I recommend the article to my colleagues who may feel Federal interference is the way to solve agricultural problems:

[From the *Kansas City Star*, Sept. 10, 1961]

SURPLUS THREAT IN SOYBEAN CROP

(By Roderick Turnbull)

Around Kansas City, across the whole of the Corn Belt and in many other parts of the country, the finest soybean crop this Nation has ever seen is heading toward maturity. The acreage is the biggest ever and the estimated average yield is at a new record.

Everything apparently is lovely except for one thing. Many growers and others interested in the soybean industry are wondering if the yield is going to be so big that soybeans will join the category of crops in surplus. Once a crop is in surplus, usually it's in trouble.

A MIRACLE CROP

With all the difficulties we have had in recent years with overproduction in farm crops it shouldn't be too unusual for another to join the list. However, this is a particular case. Soybeans have been the miracle crop in the American scene in the last couple of decades.

The acreage has grown by leaps and bounds—always in response to a growing market demand. Price supports have been kept below market levels and the crops have moved into consumption with no troublesome surpluses developing for Government bins.

This year, Orville L. Freeman, secretary of agriculture, boosted soybean price supports in a deliberate effort to increase the bean acreage to take some pressure off corn. He got a 14-percent increase in acres and with nature providing almost perfect growing weather, the increase in production now is estimated at 22 percent over last year or 683 million bushels. This estimate was made as of August 1. Many authorities are suggesting the final total will be 700 million bushels or more. The harvest last year was 558,771,000 bushels.

Is this too much of a jump in yield for 1 year? Secretary Freeman and his administrators in the Department of Agriculture express confidence that this year's huge crop will find a market.

They point to difficulties with soybeans in China, where exports are down. Other nations have smaller yields both of beans and other oil-producing crops. Japan is taking more U.S. beans. Thus the market seems to be good. Also, the administration has a big ace in the hole. It always can give more beans or soybean oil away through the Public Law 480 program.

But this is just what the soybean industry fears. The industry has grown on dollar sales. Industry representatives have gone all over the world selling the American crop.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

They have determined what other nations wanted in soybeans, in variety and in quality. They have taught other nations how to use soybeans and have convinced them in many cases that soybean oil is as good or better than other vegetable oils. The result has been a huge increase in the export trade. Nearly all bean sales have been for dollars although considerable of the oil has moved under Public Law 480 deals. The Department of Agriculture has cooperated with the industry in these efforts.

The soybean industry as represented by the American Soybean Association and the Soybean Council of America has been extremely proud of the record of the crop in the market. When Secretary Freeman boosted the price support this year from \$1.85 a bushel to \$2.30, the soybean association along with the American Farm Bureau protested that this was too high, even though bean prices at the time were still higher. Soybean prices on the market last winter hit \$3 a bushel—after most of the 1960 crop was out of farmers' hands.

RESPONSE TO PRICE

The high price last winter definitely indicated a bigger acreage this year, but a guaranteed price (Government) usually is more of a stimulus to greater production than prospects of a higher price on the market.

Farmers are using their own judgment when they increase production in response to prospective demand. They win or lose. The Government is guiding production when it sets a price support high enough to induce a larger acreage. If there is a surplus, it becomes the Government's responsibility. But surpluses hurt farm prices in Government hands or otherwise.

At the recent convention of the American Soybean Association in Indianapolis, Charles V. Simpson, president of the group, in his annual address said the major problem facing soybean farmers is to avoid expanding production faster than they can build markets for the crop.

"Let us not allow ourselves," he said, "to be priced out of world markets by those who mean well, but fail to realize that we wish only to use support prices as a means to bring the soybean crop to market in an orderly manner."

MUST FIND PLACE

George M. Strayer, the association's executive vice president, said, "I sincerely hope

we can, through united efforts of industry and Government, find a place to utilize the 683- to 700-million-bushel soybean crop. It is going to take concerted effort on the part of all concerned."

Strayer also commented that in raising price supports this year to \$2.30, the U.S. Government had announced to the remainder of the world that it was, in effect, holding a price umbrella over the production of peanuts and palm kernels, sunflower seed, rapeseed and mustard seed, cottonseed, copra and all others in the long list of oilseeds and oil-bearing materials.

The association commended the Department of Agriculture and the soybean industry for "untiring efforts in the sales and trade promotional programs for soybeans and soybean products" and urged continued efforts on these programs. It also thanked Secretary Freeman for implementing the use of fats and oils in the overseas church and charity relief feeding program.

Soybeans are called America's miracle crop because of the remarkable growth in production in recent years. In 30 years the crop has come from a \$10 million one to the billion-dollar class.

In the mid-1920's 1½ million acres were planted in soybeans; this year the acreage is 26.4 million. The yield has jumped in the same period from 5 million bushels to the prospective 683 million.

Many reasons may be given for this big increase in production, but the main one has been the growing demand for soybean meal as a protein feed for livestock and for soybean oil.

The crop first came into prominence in this country for use as hay and green manure. There was quite a buildup during the 1930's when the AAA encouraged the use of soybeans as a soil-building crop—to be turned under as green manure. In fact, up to 1941, over half the soybean acreage was for hay, grazing or green manure.

SUPPLIES CUT OFF

Before World War II, the United States was a net importer of oilseeds, fats and oils for both food and nonfood uses as well as livestock feed. Hostilities cut off many of our Far Eastern supplies at the same time a huge demand was building for them. The mixed feed industry called for great amounts of protein for livestock rations. Vegetable oils were in demand for shortening and for margarine which was replacing butter to a large extent. This demand was the springboard for soybeans. The acreage increased from 10.1 million acres in 1941 to 14.2 million in 1943 and averaged 12.8 million through the war.

Significantly, the big increase came after the end of the war. The demands for protein feeds and oils continued and expanded. Millions of acres which had been taken out of wheat, corn, and cotton under Government production control programs were diverted to the soybeans. A huge acreage once in oats also went to the beans—the oats, once needed for horses, were less in demand. During the 1950's, when every other major crop was showing a reduction in acreage, the soybean acreage jumped 124 percent—always in answer to market demand.

During this period, soybean growers actually asked that price supports be kept low enough to permit the crop to move to market.

Soybean authorities are convinced that peak has not yet been reached in demand for the crop and its byproducts. Longrun prospects suggest that within the next 10 to 15 years a billion-bushel crop may be utilized. But they wonder if the market can take in 1 year the big increase that is coming with this harvest.

BOOST FOR FARMERS

The 26 million acres in soybeans is a wonderful thing for American farmers. In

a time when we have tried to cut plantings of other crops, think how much greater our troubles would be if we did not have soybeans.

I wonder how this new crop could have developed in this country if we had had in the past production controls that specified how each acre was to be used. Where is the man, in Government or out, who could have said in 1935 that we would need 26 million acres in soybeans in 1961? Where is the man who can tell us today the acreage that should be allotted for some new crop in 1980?

The District of Columbia Government Seems To Rely Entirely on Public Urban Renewal Programs Supported by Taxes, and Has Discouraged Renovation and Restoration of Commercial and Residential Property by Private Owners by Immediately Raising Taxes on Such Improved Property, Says Kalorama Citizens Association President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Kalorama Citizens Association, G. M. Koockogey, has written to me in part, as follows:

Our District of Columbia government seems to rely entirely on public urban renewal programs, supported by tax money, and has discouraged renovation and restoration of commercial and residential property by private owners by immediately raising taxes on such improved realty. Your House Joint Resolution 532 would correct this inequity by a reasonable tax adjustment that would encourage private redevelopment without the use of public funds.

Georgetown is an outstanding example of private restoration that didn't cost the taxpayers 1 cent and greatly increased the taxable basis. Another private restoration showcase is our own Kalorama triangle area, where over half a million dollars has been spent on more than 50 houses and apartments in less than 2 years.

Other citizen groups and the Federation of Citizens Associations have joined us in endorsing your idea of reasonable tax abatement to encourage private restoration of commercial and residential property."

The Washington (D.C.) Post reported that the contest-winning design for residential development of an 8.4-acre urban renewal site in southwest Washington will provide rental apartments up to \$325 a month.

Since the urban renewal program was designed by the Congress to rehouse slum-dwellers, it would be helpful at this time if the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, told us how slum-dwellers in the Nation's Capital are able to afford apartments renting up to \$325 a month.

A letter published in the Washington (D.C.) Post on September 13 comments tellingly on these \$325-a-month apart-

ments which the New Frontier is providing in Southwest Washington with the aid of \$70 million in Federal tax funds:

Once upon a time I was naive enough to believe that the southwest redevelopment plans would include housing I could afford. However, I see by the Washington Post that still another high-rise luxury apartment project is now off the drawing boards.

I'm not rich enough for the apartments now available in Southwest, and I'm not poor enough to qualify for one of the housing projects.

A new approach to urban renewal in the District of Columbia is long overdue, and I am pleased that the able and distinguished gentlemen from New York [Mr. MULTER], Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL], and Iowa [Mr. KYL] have joined with me in trying to develop a new, far less costly, and more human approach to the renovation, restoration, and rebuilding of our cities.

I include here the text of the measure introduced by my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

I include, in addition, the letter from Mr. Koockogey, president of the Kalorama Citizens Association, to which I have referred, as well as a letter published today in the Washington (D.C.) Post:

SEPTEMBER 9, 1961.

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the Kalorama Citizens Association, of Washington, I wish to express our deep appreciation of your leadership in introducing the most constructive urban renewal legislation in the past decade; I refer to House Joint Resolution 532.

Our thanks are due also to Congressmen MULTER, Democrat, of New York, KYL, Republican, of Iowa, and McDOWELL, Democrat, of Delaware, for introducing similar bills.

This new bipartisan approach to urban renewal puts private renewal efforts in the District of Columbia on an equal basis with public urban renewal projects, which is as it should be.

Our District of Columbia government seems to rely entirely on public urban renewal programs, supported by our tax money, and has discouraged renovation and restoration of commercial and residential property by private owners by immediately raising taxes on such improved realty. Your House Joint Resolution 532 would correct this inequity by a reasonable tax adjustment that would encourage private redevelopment without the use of public funds.

Georgetown is an outstanding example of private restoration that didn't cost the taxpayers 1 cent and greatly increased the taxable basis. Another private restoration showcase is our own Kalorama Triangle area, where over half a million dollars has been spent on more than 50 houses and apartments in less than 2 years.

Other citizen groups and the Federation of Citizens Associations have joined us in endorsing your idea of reasonable tax abatement to encourage private restoration of commercial and residential property.

The fact that other Members are joining you in this legislation shows that it is of national importance to put private redevelopment all over the Nation on an equal footing with public urban renewal. This could save the taxpayers many millions of dollars and do the job in much less time.

Respectfully,

G. M. KOOCKOGY,
President, Kalorama Citizens Association.
WASHINGTON, D.C.

HOUSING COSTS

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Once upon a time I was naive enough to believe that the Southwest redevelopment plans would include housing I could afford. However, I see by the Washington Post that still another high-rise luxury apartment project is now off the drawing boards.

I'm not rich enough for the apartments now available in Southwest, and I'm not poor enough to qualify for one of the housing projects.

Is there to be no end of these overpriced new projects? Is there no hope for persons in my income bracket who would like to live close by in a place that is new and clean? Not everyone wants an air-conditioned efficiency, or a larger unit in which to double up with another salaried member of the middle class. Some of us have only one income in our family, and are old-fashioned enough to want a more conventional home that is not in the suburbs.

SUZANNE T. COOPER.

WASHINGTON.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 6 of the Act of August 14, 1894 (D.C. Code, sec. 47-705), is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 6.", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any increase in the value of the tract or lot of real property on which the taxpayer's personal residence is located (or of the improvements thereon) which is the result of the repair, alteration, renovation, or restoration of such residence shall be disregarded in making the valuation of the property under subsection (a) for the fiscal year in which such repair, alteration, renovation, or restoration is completed and for the four succeeding fiscal years. As used in the preceding sentence, the term 'taxpayer's personal residence' means real property which is owned by the taxpayer or his spouse or both at the time of the repair, alteration, renovation, or restoration involved and is occupied by them or either of them as their person residence at such time or within six months thereafter."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to repairs, alterations, renovation, and restoration completed in fiscal years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 2. (a) Section 3(a) of title III of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, sec. 47-1557b(a)) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(16) EXPENSES OF HOME REPAIR, MAINTENANCE, ALTERATIONS, AND ADDITIONS.—In the case of an individual, the expenses paid during the taxable year for the repair and maintenance of, or alterations or additions to, the personal residence of the taxpayer. The deduction under this paragraph shall be allowable only to the extent of the aggregate of such expenses actually paid by the taxpayer, and in no case shall it exceed \$2,000. Such deduction shall be applicable only to expenses which are not otherwise allowable as deductions in computing net income under section 1 of this title. As used in this paragraph, the term 'personal residence of the taxpayer' means real property which is owned by the taxpayer or his spouse or both at the time of the repair, maintenance, alterations, or additions involved and is occupied by them or either of them as their personal residence at such time or within six months thereafter."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to expenses paid during taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. Section 7 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (D.C. Code, sec. 5-706) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

"(1) housing (including both residential and commercial structures) which are not substandard in any project area shall be preserved and shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area; and

"(2) the owner of any substandard structure (residential or commercial) which can be rehabilitated or restored to good condition in a project area shall be encouraged and assisted by the Agency to undertake and carry out such rehabilitation or restoration, and such structure shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area unless such owner, after having had a reasonable time following notification by the Agency to complete such rehabilitation or restoration has failed to do so; and in the case of any such failure the Agency, after acquiring the structure, shall itself provide for such rehabilitation or restoration whenever it determines that such rehabilitation or restoration is desirable or appropriate and shall dispose of the structure so rehabilitated or restored at such time and on such terms and conditions as it may determine to be in the public interest."

SEC. 4. The Act entitled "An Act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved June 20, 1938, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 5-413 et seq.), is amended by redesignating section 17 as section 18 and by inserting after section 16 the following new section:

"Sec. 17. The provisions of this Act shall apply to chanceries and other business-type buildings of foreign nations in the District of Columbia, so as to conform with the general practice among nations of requiring the observance (by countries with which they maintain diplomatic relations) of their laws and zoning regulations in the location of such buildings; and the Zoning Commission shall accordingly include in its regulations under the first section of this Act such provisions as may be necessary to insure that such buildings are hereafter located only in areas appropriately zoned for such purposes."

Nation's Small Businessmen Strongly Oppose Free Delivery of Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the National Federation of Independent Business regularly polls its membership of over 170,000 on key issues before the country.

The NFIB Mandate No. 268 recently contained the question: "Should the Post Office carry Communist propaganda free?"

The results, forwarded to me by Mr. George P. Burger, vice president of the NFIB, show 90 percent opposed to this distribution of Communist propaganda. Only 7 percent favored the distribution and 3 percent indicated no opinion.

This is graphic evidence of the support in the Nation for legislation such as that I introduced, H.R. 9004, which would ban from our mails any material found by the Attorney General to be Communist propaganda.

I am pleased to report also that a number of our colleagues have joined me in introducing this legislation, including the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

The concern of the Congress in the continued U.S. export of goods to Communist-dominated countries is testified to in the division vote in passage of House Resolution 403 of 90 yeas to 1 nay.

In further regard to this situation, I believe the Members will be interested in some additional facts revealed recently during a hearing before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on a bill to prohibit any exchange of articles between the United States and Cuba, except those destined for U.S. military use at Guantanamo Naval Base. Although a partial economic embargo was imposed on Cuba by the United States in October 1960, trade with Cuba today is being carried on as though relations between the two nations were nearly normal.

Under the restrictions, no U.S. goods are supposed to be exported to Cuba unless they can be classified as foodstuffs or medical supplies. However, according to committee testimony, exports to Cuba from the United States for the period January through March 1961, exceeded \$6.9 million, of which \$3.6 million consisted of lard. Lard, Mr. Speaker, is vital to the manufacture of nitroglycerine. Other exports include \$400,000 in machinery and vehicles. Just last month, as an example, U.S. shipments to Communist Cuba included 42 diesel engines adaptable for military tank use.

tailing Cuban trade. Hesitation and inaction by the State Department and other offices of the administration only further serve as evidence of the executive branch's inability to combat Cuban communism in the forceful manner preached by Candidate Kennedy.

The State Department witness opposed the bill, H.R. 8459, apparently because it would weaken the flexibility of the State Department. This witness also seemed of the opinion that current shipments to Cuba are not of great consequence and therefore would not be worth the repercussions of a total economic embargo.

Other testimony before the committee brought to light the rising tide of congressional vexation against the Cuban dictatorship and determination of Members of the House to take action unless the administration does something soon.

The sponsorship of H.R. 8465 by Members of the majority party, the action of the Florida State Legislature in endorsing the resolution, and the support of the bill by Members on both sides of the aisle in this body gives testimony to the fact that the Congress, as are all Americans, is growing impatient with the administration's wait-and-see attitude regarding Cuba.

Although for humanitarian reasons, Mr. Speaker, certain organizations such as the Red Cross should be allowed to provide medical supplies to Cuban hospitals, we must refuse to continue to bolster Cuba's Communist economy. We must take a strong and decisive step as a symbol of leadership to other nations of the free world. Under present circumstances, how can we ask our friends to do what we do not do ourselves? How can we be critical of Canadian trade with Red China when we trade with Communist Cuba?

In instances such as this, I believe that when the administration refuses to take positive action, the Congress has every obligation and right to take the initiative.

Feeding the Communist Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on September 5 my very able and respected colleague, the Honorable GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, of California, performed a valuable service to all Members of this body in bringing to our attention a number of shocking facts regarding our export control program with particular reference to controls on trade with the Soviet Union. This was in connection with House consideration of House Resolution 403, creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act of 1949, and related acts.

At the same time, incoming shipments are appearing almost regularly at U.S. ports in Eastern and Gulf States, even though public indignation is so high that trucks transporting these commodities are masking their insignia to avoid public identification.

Although our Government has officially branded Cuba a clear and present danger to the security of this hemisphere, and the Congress has adopted a resolution recognizing the Communist affiliation of the present Government of Cuba, the executive branch has failed to invoke various means available for cur-

...the results, forwarded to me by Mr. George P. Burger, vice president of the NFIB, show 90 percent opposed to this distribution of Communist propaganda. Only 7 percent favored the distribution and 3 percent indicated no opinion.

This is graphic evidence of the support in the Nation for legislation such as that I introduced, H.R. 9004, which would ban from our mails any material found by the Attorney General to be Communist propaganda.

I am pleased to report also that a number of our colleagues have joined me in introducing this legislation, including the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

...the concern of the Congress in the continued U.S. export of goods to Communist-dominated countries is testified to in the division vote in passage of House Resolution 403 of 90 yeas to 1 nay.

In further regard to this situation, I believe the Members will be interested in some additional facts revealed recently during a hearing before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on a bill to prohibit any exchange of articles between the United States and Cuba, except those destined for U.S. military use at Guantanamo Naval Base. Although a partial economic embargo was imposed on Cuba by the United States in October 1960, trade with Cuba today is being carried on as though relations between the two nations were nearly normal.

Under the restrictions, no U.S. goods are supposed to be exported to Cuba unless they can be classified as foodstuffs or medical supplies. However, according to committee testimony, exports to Cuba from the United States for the period January through March 1961, exceeded \$6.9 million, of which \$3.6 million consisted of lard. Lard, Mr. Speaker, is vital to the manufacture of nitroglycerine. Other exports include \$400,000 in machinery and vehicles. Just last month, as an example, U.S. shipments to Communist Cuba included 42 diesel engines adaptable for military tank use.

...the State Department witness opposed the bill, H.R. 8459, apparently because it would weaken the flexibility of the State Department. This witness also seemed of the opinion that current shipments to Cuba are not of great consequence and therefore would not be worth the repercussions of a total economic embargo.

Other testimony before the committee brought to light the rising tide of congressional vexation against the Cuban dictatorship and determination of Members of the House to take action unless the administration does something soon.

The sponsorship of H.R. 8465 by Members of the majority party, the action of the Florida State Legislature in endorsing the resolution, and the support of the bill by Members on both sides of the aisle in this body gives testimony to the fact that the Congress, as are all Americans, is growing impatient with the administration's wait-and-see attitude regarding Cuba.

Although for humanitarian reasons, Mr. Speaker, certain organizations such as the Red Cross should be allowed to provide medical supplies to Cuban hospitals, we must refuse to continue to bolster Cuba's Communist economy. We must take a strong and decisive step as a symbol of leadership to other nations of the free world. Under present circumstances, how can we ask our friends to do what we do not do ourselves? How can we be critical of Canadian trade with Red China when we trade with Communist Cuba?

In instances such as this, I believe that when the administration refuses to take positive action, the Congress has every obligation and right to take the initiative.